

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JONATHAN COLLIN AUTRY,
Plaintiff,
v.
SCOTT JONES, *et al.*,
Defendants.

Case No. 2:22-cv-00554-TLN-JDP (PC)

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE

On October 3, 2023, I informed plaintiff that his second amended complaint was unsigned, *see* ECF No. 28, and that he would need to re-file a signed complaint within thirty days. ECF No. 29. To date, plaintiff has not filed a signed complaint or otherwise responded to the October 3, 2023 order.


To manage its docket effectively, the court requires litigants to meet certain deadlines. The court may impose sanctions, including dismissing a case, for failure to comply with its orders or local rules. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b); E.D. Cal. L.R. 110; *Hells Canyon Pres. Council v. U.S. Forest Serv.*, 403 F.3d 683, 689 (9th Cir. 2005); *Carey v. King*, 856 F.2d 1439, 1440-41 (9th Cir. 1988). Involuntary dismissal is a harsh penalty, but a district court has a duty to administer justice expeditiously and avoid needless burden for the parties. *See Pagtalunan v. Galaza*, 291 F.3d 639, 642 (9th Cir. 2002); Fed. R. Civ. P. 1.

I will give plaintiff a chance to explain why the court should not dismiss the case for his

1 failure to file a signed complaint. Plaintiff's failure to respond to this order will constitute a
2 failure to comply with a court order and will result in a recommendation that this action be
3 dismissed. Accordingly, plaintiff is ordered to show cause within twenty-one days why this case
4 should not be dismissed for failure to prosecute and failure to comply with court orders. Should
5 plaintiff wish to continue with this lawsuit, he shall file, within twenty-one days, a signed
6 complaint.

7
8 IT IS SO ORDERED.

9
10 Dated: November 30, 2023


11 JEREMY D. PETERSON
12 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28